# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

## **DOCKET NO. 2010-67-E**

Joint Petition of Mid-Carolina Electric )
Cooperative, Inc. and South Carolina )
Electric & Gas Company for )
Reassignment of Territory in Lexington )
and Saluda Counties, Exchange of )
Certain Customers and Approval of an )
Agreement to Limit Corridor Rights, )

ANALYSIS OF ACCOUNT HOLDERS' RESPONSES
TO NOTICE MAILINGS BY MID-CAROLINA
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. AND SOUTH
CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS CO.

Pursuant to the direction of the Commission, the Office of Regulatory Staff requested and received from Mid-Carolina Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Mid-Carolina") and South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. ("SCE&G") the response to the letters found at Exhibit 4A, 5A and 6A to the Petition in this matter. The Office of Regulatory Staff reviewed these responses and reports the following analysis.

## I. MID-CAROLINA

As part of the proposed reassignment of territory to avoid duplication of facilities, in favor of safety, and lower the number of lake crossings, Mid-Carolina proposes transferring 57 meters and 48 account holders in certain areas of Lexington and Saluda Counties. Mid-Carolina sent a letter to each of the 48 account holders and gave them an opportunity to send back a form objecting or not objecting to the transfer. An analysis of the responses received, or not received from the account holders follows.



Please note that Mid-Carolina and SCE&G received objections from certain account holders and held an additional meeting to further explain the territorial swap. Some account holders changed their response after the meeting.

# A. The Ward, SC Area (Exhibit 4A)

This area is located in Saluda County. Mid-Carolina and SCE&G request in the Petition to transfer 48 meters from Mid-Carolina to SCE&G. There are 39 affected account holders as some account holders have multiple meters. Mid-Carolina mailed a Notice and Response Form to the address of all 48 account holders. After the informational meetings, the final tally of responses was as follows:

<u>Ward</u> — (39 Total Account Holders): NO RESPONSE-11; OBJECT-16; DO NOT OBJECT-10 (Originally objected but changed after meeting — 2).

Thus, 23 of 39 of the account holders involved in the Ward area transfer did not object. Furthermore, to the extent the account holders wrote comments on the objections, none of them dealt with any anticipated inadequacy of electric service by SCE&G. Instead, written comments simply reflected that the account holders were pleased with the current service they received from Mid-Carolina and the payment of capital credits.

# B. <u>Lake Crossing Areas</u> (Exhibit 6A)

This area is located in Lexington County. Mid-Carolina and SCE&G requests in the Petition to transfer 9 meters from Mid-Carolina to SCE&G. Mid-Carolina mailed a Notice and Response Form to the 9 account holders who would be transferred to SCE&G service as a result of the Petition plan to eliminate lake crossings. The responses are as follows:

<u>Lake Crossings</u> – (9 Total Account Holders): NO RESPONSE-2; OBJECT-3; DO NOT OBJECT-4.

Thus, 6 out of 9 account holders did not object to the transfer of service from Mid-Carolina to SCE&G. Once again, only a few account holders wrote comments on their objections. The comments did not reflect any belief that SCE&G electric service would be inadequate but rather a preference for Mid-Carolina service and lower rates.

In conclusion, an analysis of the objections sent in response to Mid-Carolina's letters show that the majority in each area did not object to the transfer between the utilities and no issue of inadequate service under S.C. Code Ann. § 58-27-660 was raised in any objection.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS CO.

As part of the proposed reassignment of territory to avoid duplication of facilities, in favor of safety, and lower the number of lake crossings, SCE&G proposes transferring 71 account holders in an area near the Town of Saluda known as "Lake Murray Estates." SCE&G sent a letter to each of the 71 account holders and gave them an opportunity to send back a form objecting or not objecting to the transfer. An analysis of the responses received, or not received, from the account holders follows:

#### GBJECT-5; DO NOT OBJECT-38; NO RESPONSE-28

Thus, 66 of 71 of the account holders in Lake Murray Estates involved in the transfer did not object. An analysis of the objections sent in response to SCE&G's letters reflect that the majority of account holders in Lake Murray did not object to the transfer between the utilities and no issue of inadequate service under S.C. Code Ann. § 58-27-660 was raised in any objection.

# Respectfully submitted,

C. Dukes Scott, Executive Director

Office of Regulatory Staff 1401 Main Street, Suite 900

Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Ph: 803-737-0877 Fax: 803-737-0895

Columbia, South Carolina

April 26, 2010.

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

## **DOCKET NO. 2010-67-E**

Joint Petition of Mid-Carolina Electric )
Cooperative, Inc. and South Carolina Electric & )
Gas Company for Reassignment of Territory in )
Lexington and Saluda Counties, Exchange of )
Certain Customers and Approval of an Agreement )
to Limit Corridor Rights,

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing ANALYSIS OF ACCOUNT HOLDERS' RESPONSES TO NOTICE MAILINGS BY MID-CAROLINA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. AND SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS CO. has been served upon counsel of record by depositing a copy of the same, first-class postage prepaid, in the United States Mail, on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2010, to the addresses shown below.

Marcus A. Manos, Esquire
NEXSEN PRUET, LLC
1230 Main Street, Suite 700 (29201)
Post Office Drawer 2426
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

K. Chad Burgess, Esquire
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
Mail Code C222
220 Operation Way
Cayce, South Carolina 29033

Patricia T. Smith, Esquire 1229 Lincoln Street Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3135

Pamela J. McMullan